

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE

RYAN T. CARELTON,)	
)	
Plaintiff)	
)	
v.)	1:23-cv-00253-JAW
)	
PISCATAQUIS COUNTY JAIL,)	
et al.,)	
)	
Defendants)	

**ORDER ON PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO
ADMIT VIDEO AND MOTION TO STAY**

Plaintiff filed a motion to admit a video recording and a motion to stay proceedings. (Motions, ECF Nos. 33, 34.) After consideration of Plaintiff’s requests, the Court denies the motions.

Through his motion to stay, Plaintiff seeks to stay the proceedings until he either obtains legal training or the Court appoints counsel to represent him. The District Court has discretion to grant a temporary stay. *Good v. Altria Grp., Inc.*, 624 F. Supp. 2d 132, 134 (D. Me. 2009). “Generally, in evaluating whether to issue a stay, a court will consider three factors: (1) potential prejudice to the non-moving party; (2) hardship and inequity to the moving party without a stay; and (3) judicial economy.” *Id.*

The relevant factors militate against a stay. On multiple occasions, the Court has determined that the record does not currently support the appointment of counsel. In addition, the legal education Plaintiff suggests is necessary would require a protracted stay. A lengthy stay would unreasonably delay resolution of the matter to Defendants’ prejudice.

The requested stay would also not serve the interests of judicial economy, which interests include “the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action and proceeding,” Fed. R. Civ. P. 1. The Court, therefore, denies Plaintiff’s motion to stay.

In his motion to admit a video recording, Plaintiff maintains the recording supports his claim. While the recording might be relevant and ultimately admissible in evidence, Plaintiff’s request is premature. Because the discovery deadline has not expired, a trial has not been scheduled. Furthermore, there is no motion pending to which the recording is relevant. Accordingly, the Court denies Plaintiff’s motion to admit the video recording without prejudice to Plaintiff’s ability to seek to introduce the recording as evidence at trial or in connection with any dispositive motion practice.

NOTICE

Any objections to this order shall be filed in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72.

/s/ John C. Nivison
U.S. Magistrate Judge

Dated this 2nd day of February, 2024.